DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 545 UD 027 226

TITLE	English Only: The Threat of Language Restrictions. NALEO Background Paper Number 10.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials Education Fund, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	89
NOTE	28p.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Acculturation; *Civil Rights; Educational Needs; Group Unity; Hispanic Americans; *Immigrants; *Limited English Speaking; *Minority Groups; Multilingualism; *North American English; Official Languages
IDENTIFIERS	*English Only Movement; *Language Diversity

ABSTRACT

The "Official English" (OE), or "English Only," movement claims that the United States is threatened by the use of languages other than English in schools, government, and business. The OE movement is contrary to a national tradition of recognition and respect for the contributions of immigrants to American life. Restrictions on multilingualism are based on and foster an atmosphere of intolerance and xenophobia. The language restrictionist movement is based on the assumption that limited English-speaking persons do not want to learn English. Yet, cities such as New York and Los Angeles have waiting lists for English classes of 10,000 to 30,000 people. The Latino communities of Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, and New York are the prime targets of the OE efforts. Prohibiting the use of native languages is a threat to civil rights that denies access to voting, educational opportunities, and social services. Those who are serious about encouraging and enhancing the understanding and use of English should devote their efforts to the creation of more English classes and educational facilities. The following materials are appended: (1) a list of eight answers to commonly asked questions about language restriction; (2) a list of organizations opposed to OE; (3) a list of 36 references; and (4) a list of NALEO Education Fund publications. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

1/2/90

21DEC 1989

English Only:
The Threat of Language Restrictions

ED314545

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Pascal
NALEO
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 027 226

NALEO Background Paper Number 10

The NALEO Education Fund is a national, non-partisan Hispanic affairs research organization. The NALEO Education Fund issues periodic background papers on topics of relevance to the Hispanic community nationwide. Other background papers include:

Recurring Issues in Hispanic Politics. (Background Paper #1.) 1983. Price: $10.

Cuban Americans, Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans in Congressional Districts: 1980. (Background Paper #2.) 1983. Price: $5.

Federal Procurement from Latino Businesses Under the 8(a) Program by Department, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985. (Background Paper #3.) 1986. Price: $5.

Latino Voters, Citizenship and the 1984 Presidential Elections, an Update. (Background Paper #4.) 1984. Price: $5.

NALEO Audits of Small Business Administration's 8(a) Program Fiscal Year 1983 to Fiscal Year 1986. (Background Paper #5.) Price: $5.

Robert Bork: A Sharp Legal Mind or Biased Ideologue? (Background Paper #6.) 1987. Price: $1.

The Latino Vote in 1988. (Background Paper #7.) 1988. Price: $10.

New Citizens in Limbo? One in Three Applicants for U.S. Citizenship Neither Pass nor Fail. (Background Paper #8.) 1988. Price: $10.

The Second Step Process: Will California School Districts Be Able to Meet the Educational Needs of Their Legalization Applicants? (Background Paper #9.) 1988. Price: $10.

English Only: The Threat of Language Restrictions. (Background Paper #10.) 1989. Price: $10.

NALEO
708 G Street, SE
Washington, D.C. 20003
(202) 546-2536

NALEO
2300 W. Commerce #204
San Antonio, TX 78207
(512) 227-8919

NALEO
1114 S. Lorena
Los Angeles, CA 90023
(213) 262-8503

English Only:
The Threat of Language Restrictions

NALEO Background Paper Number 10

Copyright © 1989 by the NALEO Education Fund, Washington, D.C.

Project Researcher: Robert Paral, NALEO Education Fund

Table of Contents

Introduction ____ 1

Historical Aspects of Language Usage in the United States ____ 3

U.S. English and Today's Language Restrictionists ____ 4

Official English Movement's Goals ____ 6

Official English Legislative Targets ____ 10

Facts to Counteract the Language Restrictionists ____ 13

Conclusion ____ 15

Questions and Answers Asked ____ 16

Language Restriction Opponents ____ 18

Footnotes ____ 19

Introduction

Tolerance of Other Languages is Cornerstone of American Society

Elected and appointed officials are increasingly confronted with the need to address the misleading claims of the growing "English only" or "official English" movement. Supporters claim that the United States is threatened by the use of languages other than English in schools, government and business.

Countering the claims of these language restrictionists is difficult: they typically wrap their arguments in patriotic rhetoric. Upon examination, however, the movement proves contrary to the ideal of recognition and respect for the contributions of the immigrant community to American life. Moreover, the restrictions on multilingualism are based upon, and foster an atmosphere of intolerance and xenophobia toward ethnic minorities in the United States.

The language restrictionist movement is largely based on the assumption that persons of limited English skills in the United States do not want to learn English. Clearly, this assumption is incorrect. Most school districts with large numbers of immigrants have great demands for English classes. For example, more than 30,000 persons are on waiting lists for English classes in Los Angeles. In New York, 10,000 individuals await an opportunity to study English.

Unfortunately, the Latino community has been the prime target of language-restrictionist efforts. Indeed, English only efforts have been targeted at areas with large Hispanic populations — Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida and New York.

This report seeks to provide information necessary to refute accusations made by language restrictionists. A well-informed public tends to

reject efforts to declare an official language. Persons interested in preserving our nation's heritage of pluralism will be better able to battle English Only if they are aware of the background of these movements, and what our society stands to lose if their efforts are successful.

This publication is another in a series of NALEO papers that address civic affairs issues affecting the Hispanic community, as well as all persons concerned with the defense of ethnic rights in the United States.

Edward R. Roybal
Member of Congress
President, NALEO
Board of Directors

Harry Pachon, Ph.D.
National Director

Historical Aspects of Language Usage in the United States

The use of languages other than English has always played an important role in assisting immigrants and encouraging their integration into American society. To earn the support of German-speaking persons, for example, the Continental Congress printed the Articles of Confederation in German during the War for Independence.[1] The laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania were published in German and English from 1805 to 1850.[2] From 1804 to 1867, Louisiana published its laws in French and English.[3]

Nevertheless, the fear that languages other than English pose a threat to the United States also dates back to the early years of the nation. As far back as the 18th century, established residents expressed fears that immigrants were undermining the supremacy of English. Commentators of that day expressed concern that immigrants were failing to assimilate into American society.[4] Later, 19th century nativists railed against the supposedly dangerous influence of non-English-speaking immigrants, such as Italians.

Modern-day language restrictionists argue that multilingualism in the United States has now reached a critical mass unprecedented in its ability to undermine our society. Typically, these proponents point to the large presence of limited-English speaking Asian and Hispanic immigrants in our nation's cities.

Yet, historically, previous generations of Americans to the United States overcame these fears and narrow-minded views to favor an inclusive — rather than exclusive — attitude towards languages. This is a cornerstone of our nation's linguistic tolerance today.

U.S. English and Today's Language Restrictionists

Today's official English (OE) efforts are largely the work of U.S. English, an organization based in Washington, D.C., which has spent more than $18 million to promote official language legislation.[5] During the 1988 effort to pass a referendum authorizing an amendment to the Arizona constitution to make English the official state language, U.S. English at one point contributed 97 percent of the movement's funds;[6] during the 1986 campaign to pass Proposition 63, an OE amendment in California, U.S. English spent $700,000.[7] While U.S. English professes to desire greater social harmony in the United States, the group has recently been the focus of serious controversy over that claim.

As Whites see their power and control ... declining, will they simply go quietly into the night? Or will there be an explosion?

John Tanton, U.S. English Founder

John Tanton, co-founder of U.S. English, had previously helped launch the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), an immigration-restrictionist organization. While Tanton was the chairman of FAIR, the group accepted a $370,000 grant from the Pioneer Fund, an organization linked to the promotion of eugenics — a philosophy that seeks to "improve" racial characteristics.[8] In the 1970s, the Pioneer Fund financed research purporting to prove that blacks are less intelligent than whites.[9] Tanton has denied knowledge of these activities of the Pioneer Fund.

Despite Tanton's background, U.S. English avoided serious controversy until 1988. It was discovered then that Tanton had written a memo

that raises the specter of serious, negative consequences of Latin American immigration, mentioning the potential of the Catholic Church to "pitch out the separation of church and state."[10]

The memo asks: "As whites see their power and control over their lives declining, will they simply go quietly into the night?" Tanton's internal memo questions whether whites will allow "power" to be taken by a growing minority population, which is fueled, in part, by high fertility rates. The memo callously suggests that the growing minority population will create "the first instance in which those with their pants up are going to get caught by those with their pants down."

Linda Chavez, president of U.S. English at that time, resigned when the memo was published in an Arizona newspaper. Chavez, who served in the Reagan Administration, declared that Tanton's memo "displayed a bias against both Catholics and Hispanics."[11] She summed up the thrust of Tanton's memo by writing: "The message is unmistakable — a white Protestant majority is threatened to be overtaken by persons whose values and traditions are alien."[12] Journalist Walter Cronkite, a member of U.S. English's Board of Advisors, also resigned in the wake of the Tanton memo.

Official English Movement's Goals

Threat to Minority Rights

An examination of the OE movement shows that its organizers and supporters have an agenda that seeks to:

- Reduce the scope of bilingual education to children with limited-English speaking abilities;

- Eliminate or restrict the use of foreign languages in the provision of social services such as bilingual emergency medical assistance;

- Eliminate bilingual ballots.

Supporters of the OE movement have suggested numerous changes in society's compact with residents who speak a language other than English. Among OE's targets are:

Restriction of Bilingual Education: The Bilingual Education Act of 1967, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, offers financial assistance to bilingual educational programs.

Restriction of bilingual education is a primary goal of OE supporters. U.S. English states that bilingual assistance in education "should be short term and transitional."[13] This position challenges the availability of viable bilingual education and funding programs in communities in many parts of the United States. These schools offer bilingual education assistance with the financial support of the Bilingual Education Act.

The Bilingual Education Act already stresses the need to promote a child's rapid acquisition of English. The clamor raised in favor of short, transitional bilingual education programs gratuitously implies that bilingual education does not already emphasize the learning of English.

Certain language restrictionist measures introduced in Congress, as

well as some state amendments, contain wording that allows the use of a student's native language in educational programs as long as the intent of the program is to make the pupil proficient in English.[14] This apparent concession to bilingual education is a masked attempt to usurp the definition of bilingual education according to OE parameters.[15] If the goal of a bilingual education program is merely to make students "proficient in English," the use of a pupil's native language may be relegated to a role so constricted as to be useless.

Official English threatens 911 emergency services, public health information and other basic community services

Restriction of Social Services: Governments need to be able to provide basic information in appropriate languages to populations with limited English skills. Effective government interaction with these communities requires second language assistance in areas such as emergency services, mass transportation and telecommunication. Supporters of an OE amendment to the U.S. Constitution admit that it would "prevent federal, state and local governments from mandating multilingual postings or publications."[16]

The prohibition of the use of languages other than English in official contexts could threaten the viability of 911 emergency telephone services for countless individuals. In a time of panic or crisis, people with limited-English skills may have trouble fully understanding assistance being given over the telephone. In many cities, people with limited-English abilities have saved lives and/or provided immediate care because of bilingual operators. Nevertheless, the former head of Florida English was quoted as stating, "everybody calling the emergency line should have to learn enough English so they can say 'fire' or 'emergency' and give the address."[17]

The hindrance of medical care that could result from OE restrictions would also have a detrimental impact on the dissemination of AIDS-

related information. AIDS in the minority community is at alarmingly higher rates than the general population; today, more than 14,000 cases of AIDS have been reported in the Hispanic community and there is an urgent need for up-to-date bilingual information projects.

Public transportation systems in many large cities provide information in Spanish. The removal of foreign-language public information in these systems would restrict the mobility of individuals, particularly lower-income persons who rely on such services in order to reach their place of employment. It would also place large numbers of people at risk of serious injury by failing to warn them of hazards, such as high-voltage transformers, electricified train rails, etc...

The failure to provide assistance in second languages at employment offices would further isolate ethnic communities. Ironically, they would be slowed from undergoing the assimilation that OE advocates purport to hold so dear.

If social workers were prohibited from communicating in a second language with recipients of public aid, they would have a difficult time ascertaining the true needs of their clients. Ultimately, social workers would be hindered in their effort to help persons free themselves from public assistance.

In legal contexts, an OE policy threatens due-process protections. Parole hearings, courtroom situations and attorney-client relations could all be altered in a single-language atmosphere.

Restriction of Voting Rights: The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was amended in 1975 to require the distribution of bilingual voting materials in certain jurisdictions.[18] Supporters of OE measures have fought to abolish bilingual ballots. S.I. Hayakawa, a former U.S. Senator and co-founder of U.S. English, writes: "Multilingual ballots threaten to divide us along language lines."[19]

In an era of declining voter participation, effort should be dedicated to persuading larger numbers of voters to participate in elections, rather than restricting access to the ballot. Hard-won civil rights victories extended the vote to minority groups in the 1960s and 1970s. The effect of rescinding bilingual ballots would be to disenfranchise a community that only

recently has had the opportunity to engage in participatory democracy.

The Threat to Private Industry

Restriction of Multilingual Commerce: OE supporters have endorsed measures that would restrict the ability of businesses to market products in languages other than English.

Supporters of language restrictionism have reportedly petitioned the Federal Communications Commission to investigate whether Spanish-language radio programs were adversely affecting English-language radio programming in Texas. OE supporters in California campaigned against the publication of Spanish-language telephone Yellow Pages in California.[20]

Language policy should recognize the competitive role of the United States in international trade. Jurisdictions that have tourism and foreign business contributing to their local economies need the flexibility to provide a range of services in any appropriate language. The 1980 anti-bilingual measure passed in Dade County, Florida, had to be amended in 1984 in order to protect the promotion of international tourism. (Also in Dade County, an OE leader opposed bilingual menus posted in McDonald's restaurants.[21])

In the area of telecommunications, the use of various languages assists businesses in marketing millions of dollars of products. Combined English- and Spanish-language advertising and promotion aimed at Hispanics totaled more than $550 million in 1988.[22]

The failure of U.S. schools to produce a sufficient number of graduates fluent in a second language affects the ability of U.S. businesses to market their products internationally. This language myopia is encouraged by the language restrictionist movement. It has been, however, criticized by the Task Force on International Education of the National Governors' Association.[23] OE would hinder the promotion of the United States as a tourist destination -- particularly in the states of Arizona, California, Florida, New Mexico, New York and Texas -- by threatening their ability to develop brochures, promotional materials, etc...

English Only's Legislative Targets

One of the ways of obtaining language-restriction objectives is through the enactment of a U.S. Constitutional amendment declaring English the official language of the nation. There have been regular, unsuccessful, attempts in Congress to pass legislation that would initiate the creation of an English Language Amendment during the past few years.[24]

Passage of an English Language Amendment bill in Congress would lead to a call for state legislatures to vote on amending the U.S. Constitution. The amendment would become official on approval by three-fourths of the state legislatures. Such bills, however, have never progressed far enough to be voted on by the entire Congress. In the first part of 1989, there were four English Language Amendment bills introduced in the 101st Congress. The four, which were all introduced in the House of Representatives, failed to gain serious consideration by the Members of Congress.

English - Language Amendments and Pro-English Laws in Key States:

Since efforts at the federal level have not been successful, OE activities have been more concentrated in certain states. Four states — Arizona, California, Colorado and Florida — have amended their constitutions in recent years to declare English the official language.[25] These state amendments were mandated via popular referenda — often after bitter fights that divided voters into ethnic/racial camps.

Voters passed the amendments in California, Colorado and Florida by secure margins. Passage in Arizona, however, was by a margin of less than 1 percent. The narrow approval in Arizona is attributed to the fact that John Tanton's controversial memo appeared first in Arizona and was more widely discussed there. Also, the amendment in the Arizona constitution is the most restrictive of the three state amendments approved in 1988; rather than merely designating English as the official state language, it specifically prohibits the use of other languages in official contexts.

The narrow passage of the Arizona English Language Amendment demonstrates that electoral support for an OE policy diminishes when two criteria are present: First, widespread knowledge of the possible xenophobic tendencies of some OE supporters; second, explicit OE initiatives that clearly spell out the intended effects of the movement.

Discriminatory incidents have been reported to occur shortly after the passage of state English Language Amendments.

• Two days after Florida passed its amendment, a supermarket manager in Coral Gables fired an employee for speaking Spanish to another employee.[26]

• In Grand Junction, Colorado, a bus driver reportedly ordered children not to speak Spanish in the vehicle he was driving. This occurred days after the passage of the Colorado amendment.

Apart from the four states with OE constitutional amendments, 13 other states have some form of English policy codified.[27] The enacting language differs from state to state, but all 13 laws declare English to be the "official" language of the state.

Local jurisdictions have also deliberated on restrictions of language

use. Dade County, Florida, passed an anti-bilingual ordinance in 1980. The City Council of Monterey Park, California, considered an ordinance in February 1986 that would have mandated manufacturing and commercial businesses to post signs in English "describing the nature of the business conducted on the property."[28]

In early 1989, a movement arose to pass English Only legislation in Suffolk County, New York, a county with a large and growing Hispanic population. Aside from declaring English to be the official language of the county, the law would prohibit the County Human Rights Commission from investigating complaints stemming from the county's use of languages other than English to communicate with its residents; the proposal was so restrictive that even the director of policy development for U.S. English voiced reservations, calling it "counterproductive."[29] The legislation was eventually defeated.

Another legislative defeat of language restrictionism in 1989 occured in New Mexico, where an "English Plus" resolution was adopted by the state legislature. The concept of English Plus recognizes the strength inherent in multilingual residents, along with the need to provide adequate opportunities for persons of limited English abilities to receive language instruction. The New Mexico resolution reads, in part:

> the State of New Mexico hereby reaffirms its advocacy of the teaching of other languages in the United States and its belief that the position of English is not threatened. Proficiency on the part of our citizens in more than one language is to the economic and cultural benefit of our State and the Nation...Proficiency in English plus other languages should be encouraged throughout the State...

Facts to Counteract the Language Restrictionists

Research and Reality

Empirical studies refute language restrictionists' claims that the use of various languages threatens the United States. A major study of Mexican immigration to California performed by the Rand Corporation found:[30]

> Mexican immigrants are following the classic American pattern for integrating into U.S. society...[31] (The) widespread concerns about Mexican immigrants are generally unfounded...Mexican immigrants are not fostering a separate society; they are integrating into the state's society exactly as other immigrants have done.[32]

Regarding the transition that Mexican immigrants in California make to English language use, the Rand study concluded:

> Most of the first generation native-born are bilingual, and more than 90 percent are proficient in English; more than half of the second generation are monolingual English speakers. Thus, the transition to English begins almost immediately and proceeds very rapidly.[33]

Another report on language use by Hispanics also demonstrates that they are assimilating into American society at rates similar to those of previous immigrants. Author Calvin Veltman found that by the time Latino immigrants have been in the United States 15 years, some 75 percent are speaking English on a regular daily basis.[34]

A U.S. General Accounting Office study asked 10 educational experts whether they felt current research presented sufficient evidence to support

the use of second languages in assisting students in acquiring competence in English.[35] Six of the eight that responded to the question felt that the current research "showed positive effects for transitional bilingual education on students' achievement of English-language competence." These experts in effect supported a key element of bilingual education: the use of a student's native language in his or her education.

Puerto Rico

Opponents of Spanish language use in the United States either misunderstand or disregard the ramifications of the United States' relationship with Puerto Rico. As a result of the Jones Act of 1917, Puerto Ricans automatically receive U.S. citizenship at birth, and they are granted the majority of privileges afforded to persons born in the United States.

Like all U.S. citizens, Puerto Ricans are allowed to freely move and work within the mainland of the United States. They are subject to military conscription. Federal law does not proscribe the use of Spanish by Puerto Ricans, who form large communities in many U.S. mainland cities. An official language amendment to the U.S. Constitution could permanently prevent Puerto Rico from achieving statehood, if this proved to be the desire of the residents of the island.

Finally, the effort to discriminate against the use of second languages most affects the use of Spanish.[36] This has the result of appearing to reject Hispanic culture in general. In an era in which there is clear need to maintain a dynamic relationship with Latin America, in which the United States should make every effort to communicate with the nations in our hemisphere, language restrictionist measures send a message of intolerance and ethnocentrism.

Conclusion

The United States has had a multilingual character since its inception. As a nation of immigrants, we have grown up with a variety of languages and cultures. Fears surrounding the use of languages other than English have also existed since the beginning of the Republic, yet tolerance of languages has proved a touchstone in demonstrating the U.S. commitment to pluralism. Attempts to restrict and punish the use of other languages contradicts the openness and magnanimity that have characterized much of America's relationship with immigrant communities.

Severely prohibiting a person's use of his or her native language is a threat to civil rights. Complete access to voting, educational opportunities and social services is endangered by myopic language policies. American commerce and industry also suffer from ethnocentric restraints on their language use.

Individuals and groups who are serious about encouraging and enhancing the understanding and use of English should devote their efforts to the creation of more English classes and educational facilities. Restrictive laws have not, and will not, help people learn English; teachers and classes will.

Answers to Questions Commonly Asked

The following are questions that concerned citizens should be prepared to answer regarding the language restrictionist movement. These representative questions have been compiled from actual interviews.

Why should we be concerned about the effort to make English the official language of the United States?

The creation of an English Only amendment to the U.S. Constitution can have the effect of promoting intolerance of ethnic minorities. Such an amendment would serve to limit the rights of persons residing in the United States, rather than expand the rights of all of us.

Won't an English language amendment encourage more people to learn English?

Non-English speakers already want to learn the language. There are long waiting lists throughout the country for English-as-a-second-language classes. The proposed language restrictionist amendments do not even attempt to provide for increased efforts toward the instruction of English to the people in need. People don't learn language because of laws; they learn through classes.

What are some of the ways that English Only measures would promote discrimination?

These amendments could lead to the abolishment of vital services, such as 911 emergency systems, in second languages. Bilingual education could be eliminated or be severely restricted. English Only supporters have called for the elimination of bilingual voting ballots.

How can English Only amendments adversely affect commerce and industry?

The movement has pressured some members of private industry to severely limit their use of languages other than English. This can seriously affect American business' ability to market its products and services.

American businesses need to be free to communicate in whatever

language they feel is effective. Language restrictionists can handcuff a businessman's efforts to reach out to consumers that live in or that visit the United States.

Supporters of English Only say the English language unites Americans. Isn't this true?

No one disputes that English is the common language of the United States. But respect for the rights of all persons is a greater bond among Americans. An assault on the dignity of ethnic minorities is an assault on the essence of American civil rights.

Is the United States in danger of experiencing a separatist movement similar to the situation in Quebec?

It is the supporters of English Only who seek to restrict, prohibit and discriminate along the lines of language. Defenders of the rights of ethnic minorities do not support separatism. Quebec did not experience language problems until attempts arose to declare a language "official." Furthermore, it was largely the second-class treatment of French-speaking residents that led to attempts to protect the use of the French language.

If we do not declare English to be the official language of the United States, is there a chance that another language will become co-equal to the English language in this country?

In earlier periods of American history, there were larger proportions of residents speaking languages other than English than we see today. Promoters of English Only try to create a fear that English can be threatened. American history proves this contention to be unfounded.

Many persons feel that since their grandparents weren't given bilingual assistance, neither should today's immigrants. How do you feel about that?

First, since colonial times the United States has indeed used second languages in official publications and in educational contexts. Second, the jobs that are available today require more complex skills than the jobs of earlier eras; all persons in the United States need extensive preparation for the modern workplace.

Language Restriction Opponents

Language restrictionist ideology has been rejected by major organizations and individuals throughout the United States. Statements in opposition to official English movements have been issued by the following groups:

American Civil Liberties Union
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
American Jewish Committee
American Jewish Congress
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith
Catholic Bishops of Florida
Center for Applied Linguistics
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
Episcopal Church
Haitian American Anti-Defamation League
Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce
Latin American Chamber of Commerce of U.S.A.
League of United Latin American Citizens
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund
National Association for Bilingual Education
National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials
National Council of Churches in the U.S.A.
National Council of La Raza
National Council of Teachers of English
National Education Association
National Lawyers Guild
National Puerto Rican Coalition
People for the American Way
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)
President George Bush
Reformed Church in America
Tomás Rivera Center
United Church of Christ

Footnotes

[1] Wagner, "The Historical Background of Bilingualism and Biculturalism in the United States," in *The New Bilingualism: An American Dilemma* (Los Angeles, Univeristy of Southern California Press, 1981) 31

[2] "Official English: Federal Limits on Efforts to Curtail Bilingual Services in the STates," in Harvard Law Review Vol. 100, No. 6 April 1987. 1345-1362

[3] ibid

[4] In 1753, Benjamin Franklin wrote of the Germans in Pennsylvania: "they come in droves... and of the six printing houses in the Province, two are entirely German, two half German half English, and but two entirely English...In short unless the stream of their importation could be turned from this to other Colonies... they will soon outnumber us, that all the advantages we have will not (in My Opinion) be able to preserve our language, and even our Government will become precarious..." See Ira M. Leonard and Robert D. Parmet in *American Nativism, 1830-1860* (New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1971)

[5] Chet Barfield, in *San Diego Tribune*, March 3, 1989.

[6] *The Arizona Republic*, October 9, 1988.

[7] James Crawford *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory and Practice* (Trenton, New Jersey, Crane Publishing Co. Inc., 1989) 53

[9] *Hispanic Link Weekly Report*, Vol. 6, No. 42. October 24, 1988.

[10] ibid

[13] *U.S. English Update* Vol. 6, No. 44. November 7, 1988.

[14] For instance, Section 3 of H.J. Resolution 23, an English Only resolution introduced in the House of Representatives on January 3, 1989, reads: "This article shall not prohibit any law, ordinance, regulation, order, decree, program, or policy requiring educational instruction in a language other than English for the purpose of making students who use a language other than English proficient in English."

[15] "(P)arties hostile to bilingual programs might be able to use the state's declaration of an official language to support attempts to have courts invalidate a state's bilingual programs" "Official English: Federal limits on Efforts to Curtail Bilingual Services in the States" 1346-1347.

[16] U.S. English publication: *Fact Sheet English Language Amendment.* April, 1987.

[17] James Crawford "Conservative Groups Take Aim at Bilingual Education Programs" in *Education Week* March 19, 1986.

[18] "In 1975...Congress amended the Voting Rights Act and explicitly required distribution of bilingual voting materials in any jurisdiction where more than five percent of the citizens of voting age are members of a single language minority and the percentage of such persons who have not complete the fifth primary grade is higher than the national rate." "Official English: Federal Limits on Efforts to Curtail Bilingual Services in the States" 1351

[19] S.I.Hayakawa, writing in a fundraising letter of U.S. English.

[20] *Are English Language Amendments in the national Interest? An Analysis of Proposals to Establish English as the Official Language of the United States* A joint project between the Tomás Rivera Center and the National Council of La Raza (Claremont, California, The Tomás Rivera Center, 1986)

[21] James Crawford "Conservative Groups Take Aim at Bilingual Education Programs"

[22] *Hispanic Business* magazine, December, 1988.

[23] *America in Transition, The International Frontier. Report of the Task Force on International Education* Washington, D.C. National Governors' Association. 1989

[24] At the beginning of the 101st Congress (1989), four bills calling for an Official English U.S. Constitutional amendement were introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives. Similar bills had been introduced in both houses of Congress in previous legislative sessions. No bills have ever reached the floor of either house for a vote.

[25] California voters approved an English Only amendement to their state constitution in November 1986. Popular referenda approved similar amendments in Arizona, Colorado and Florida in November 1988.

[26] *Daytona Beach News-Journal* November 16, 1988.

[27] Mark Guervitz, "States Designating English as the Official State Language" (Washington, D.C., Congressional Research Service, Report for Congress, March 9, 1988.)

[28] *Los Angeles Times* February 26, 1986 Section I, p. 2, col. 4

[29] *New York Times*, February 14, 1989

[30] Kevin F. McCarthy, R. Burciaga Valdez *Current and Future Effects of Mexican Immigration in California* (Santa Monica, California, The Rand Corporation, November, 1985)

[31] ibid. vii

[32] ibid. 2-3

[33] ibid. 28

[34] Calvin Veltman, *The Future of Spanish Language in the United States* (Washington, D.C., Hispanic Policy Development Project, 1988)

[35] *Bilingual Education. A New Look at the Research Evidence* (Washington, D.C., United States General Accounting Office, March 1987)

[36] Other ethnic groups, however, recognize the threat posed to them by Official English. The *Intermountain Jewish News* wrote: For Jews "There should therefore be a special twinge of conscience, a special streat of embarrassment, a special twist of intellectual fright, when we hear about proposals to make English this state's only official language -- as if the only people in this state integrally connected to another language are Hispanics." (*Intermountain Jewish News*, January 23, 1987.)